

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After entry of this amendment, claims 1, 5-16, 18-19, and 24-49 will remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 15, 29, and 38 were previously amended in a proposed amendment and discussed with the Examiner on July 16, 2009. Those proposed amendments have been included here for clarity.

Claims 38-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., Combined Data-Driven and Event-driven Scheduling Technique for Fast Distributed Cosimulation in view of Ghosh et al., A Hardware-Software Co-simulator for Embedded System Design and Debugging.

Reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of these claims in light of these remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 5-16, 18-19, and 34-37 have been allowed.

Statement of Substance of Interview

A phone conversation between the Examiner and the Undersigned took place on or about July 16, 2009. The proposed amendments to claims 1, 15, 29, and 38 were discussed. Those amendments are listed above so that the record is clear. Agreement was reached regarding claims 1, 5-16, 18-19, and 34-37. Agreement was not reached regarding claims 38-49. The Undersigned and Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the productive phone conversation.

Claim 38

Claim 38 has been amended to recite “receiving a variable synchronization parameter; wherein the variable synchronization parameter may be dynamically varied.” Claim 38 should be allowable at least for similar reasons as claims 1, 15, and 29 as stated in the pending office action. (See pending office action, page 10, first four paragraphs.)

Claim 44

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Ghosh. But this combination of references does not show or suggest each and every element of this claim. For example, claim 44 recites “controlling the first simulation from the

software debugger using the inter-process communications protocol.” The combination of references does not show or suggest this feature in combination with the other recited elements.

The pending office action cites the abstract of Ghosh as showing this feature.
(See pending office action, page 6, last paragraph.)

Ghosh shows a hardware-software co-simulator tool. (See Ghosh, abstract.) This tool contains simulators for different parts of the system, as well as a backplane to integrate the simulators. (*id.*) But Ghosh does not show controlling either simulator. For example, Ghosh does not show controlling a simulator from a software debugger. The pending office action recognizes that Kim does not show or suggest this feature. (See pending office action page 6, second to last paragraph.) Accordingly, the combination of cited references does not show or suggest controlling the first simulation from the software debugger using the inter-process communications protocol, in combination with the other recited elements. For at least these reasons, claim 44 should be allowed.

Other claims

The remaining rejected claims depend on one of the above claims and should be allowed for at least the same reasons and the additional limitations they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal notice of allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Application number 10/618,284
Amendment dated October 20, 2009
Reply to office action of July 20, 2009

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/ J. Matthew Zigmant /

J. Matthew Zigmant
Reg. No. 44,005

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
JMZ:jmz
62268410 v1